

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-18, and 20-22 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 7, 8, 14, and 16 being the independent claims. Based on the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-10, 14, 16-18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,192,340 to Abecassis in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,996,015 to Day and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,785,244 to Roy. Claims 21 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Abecassis in view of Day and Rose and further in view U.S. Patent No. 5,479,536 to Comerford. Applicant respectfully traverses.

The Examiner admits that "Abecassis does not explicitly indicate selecting specific clips accomplished by user interaction with a menu generated by the server and that the menu interaction and the multimedia device is authenticated prior to granting access to said plurality of multimedia clips." Office Action, p. 3 (emphasis in original). However, the Examiner states that "Roy teaches a system with a client and server where the client receives multimedia content and clips from the server (Column 2, lines 25-36) where the server authenticates the user's request for multimedia clips before the client can gain access (Column 5, lines 5-7)." Office Action, pp. 3-4. Applicant disagrees that the combination of Abecassis, Day and Roy teach the claimed invention.

Roy teaches that the "multimedia bridge 114 then examines whether the request is valid and/or has proper authorization. If the multimedia request of the user device 100 is not valid and/or not authorized, the multimedia bridge 114 sends a rejection message to the user device 100." Col. 5, lines 5-9. However, merely authorizing the user's *request* is not sufficient to teach or suggest the claimed invention. Independent claims 1, 7, 8, 14, and 16 each recite authenticating *a multimedia device* (not merely a user or a user's request). Authenticating the multimedia device protects against unauthorized devices (not merely users) from downloading multimedia clips. This feature prevents a single user from downloading multimedia clips to unauthorized devices (whether owned by the user or a third party). Accordingly, independent claims 1, 7, 8, 14, and 16 are patentable over the art of record.

Further, claims 2-6 and 21 depend from claim 1, claims 9, 10, 12-13 depend from claim 8, and claims 17, 18, 20 and 22 depend from claim 16. For at least the reasons provided above with regard to the independent claims, and further in view of their own features, dependent claims 2-6, 10, 12-13, 17, 18, and 20-22 are patentable over the combination of the applied art.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-10, 12-14, 16-18 and 20-22 be withdrawn that that these claims be passed to allowance.

***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Robert Sokohl  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 36,013

Date: June 19, 2007

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600

660535\_1.DOC